



CANNON BUILDING
861 SILVER LAKE BLVD., SUITE 203
DOVER, DELAWARE 19904-2467

STATE OF DELAWARE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

TELEPHONE: (302) 744-4500
FAX: (302) 739-2711
WEBSITE: WWW.DPR.DELAWARE.GOV

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES:	BOARD OF ARCHITECTS Subcommittee Meeting with Delaware Tech
MEETING DATE AND TIME:	Wednesday, December 5, 2012 at 1:30 p.m.
PLACE:	861 Silver Lake Blvd., Conference Room B, Second floor, Dover, Delaware
MINUTES APPROVED:	January 2, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT

Joseph Schorah, Public Member, Secretary
Peter H. Jennings, RA, Professional Member
Richard Wertz, RA, Professional Member
John Mateyko, RA, Professional Member

DIVISION STAFF/DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

Meaghan Jerman, Administrative Specialist II
Andrew Kerber, Deputy Attorney General

OTHERS PRESENT

David Pedersen, Delaware Technical Community College
Michael Wheedleton, Delaware Technical Community College

Call to Order

Mr. Jennings called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m.

New Business

Mr. Jennings confirmed that the Board of Architect members who would be participating in the subcommittee included himself, Richard Wertz and John Mateyko. Mr. Pedersen informed the subcommittee that Delaware Tech would be represented by himself, Pat Ryan, and Barbara Weatherly. Ms. Weatherly is assistant to legal counsel at Delaware Tech. Mr. Schorah recommended the subcommittee consider meeting without legal counsel and wait to involve legal counsel until the time at which the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is drafted. Mr. Kerber agreed with this suggestion stating the Board members and academic members can meet and then present what they have come up with to himself and Ms. Weatherly which they can then put into a draft MOU. Michael Wheedleton from Delaware Tech agreed to be a part of the subcommittee in place of Ms. Weatherly.

Mr. Jennings inquired what dates and locations were convenient for the subcommittee to meet. Subcommittee members agreed that Dover was a convenient meeting location and were in agreement that meeting following the next Board of Architects (BOA) meeting on January 2, 2013

would be acceptable. Mr. Kerber suggested that as the next meeting would be held following a BOA meeting that the subcommittee could publicly notice the meeting and use administrative staff for support. Mr. Jennings also suggested the subcommittee consider holding another meeting on January 16, 2013 at 2 p.m. at the Division of Professional Regulation. Ms. Jerman confirmed there was conference room availability on this date. Ms. Jerman will provide subcommittee members with the contact information of those participating so they may correspond via email, telephone etc. as needed. Mr. Pedersen has an initial draft of an agreement that he agreed he will send to the subcommittee members to review in advance of the next meeting.

Mr. Mateyko explained that he wants to ensure that the purpose of the Service Learning project is to advance the academic environment of the architectural program at Delaware Tech. Mr. Mateyko requested Delaware Tech staff consider limiting the organizations that they will work with on the Service Learning project to 1-2 projects a year. Mr. Wheedleton agreed that he thought this was a fair request and Mr. Pedersen stated that typically they do not do more than 1-2 projects a year. Mr. Wheedleton added that the College needs to further clarify the screening process for the nonprofit organizations who will take part in the Service Learning projects and that the screening process needs to align with the College's academic calendar. Mr. Jennings requested that the nonprofit organization who will be working with the College be required to sign a contract so that they are clear on the terms of the services that will be provided by Delaware Tech.

Mr. Pedersen stated that the Service Learning projects are purely academic and are designed to give students a real world experience. Mr. Pedersen added that he wanted to remind all subcommittee members that the Delaware Tech program is a 2 year program and they are not training students to be architects. Mr. Pedersen stated on average he has 1-2 students that go on to an architectural program. The mission of the program, Mr. Pedersen stated, is to train architectural technologists.

Mr. Pedersen shared with the subcommittee an experience the College had with the Brick Hotel in Georgetown, Delaware. The students utilized AutoCAD to document the building from scratch. The building was later purchased and the College was able to release the drawings, including the CAD files, to an architectural firm. Mr. Pedersen shared that one of the skillsets they would like to see the technology student's possess is the ability to measure and document drawings. Mr. Wheedleton stated that it would be the responsibility of the architect in a situation such as this, to confirm the accuracy of the measurements prior to signing off on the documents. Mr. Mateyko reminded the group that the issue at hand is whether it is appropriate that the drawings or other items created later be distributed as instruments as service.

Mr. Pedersen inquired if the MOU they are looking to create will be between the Board and himself or between the Board and Delaware Tech. Mr. Mateyko advised that is a matter they will have to look into further. Mr. Mateyko shared that while he is still undecided in his decision, at the present time he feels that the documents that will be created in the Service Learning project are instruments of service and should not be released due to the possibility of inaccuracies as they were completed as part of a learning process. Mr. Mateyko added that the real value in the project is that their skills were advanced. Mr. Pedersen inquired if instruments of service included Asbuilt drawings. Mr. Mateyko advised that in his opinion it would include Asbuilt drawings. Mr. Jennings shared that one of the issues that needs to be considered is that it may not matter if there is a licensed architect overseeing the project as Mr. Pedersen cannot be practicing architecture as Delaware Tech and the only way he can be practicing is individually. Mr. Pedersen explained that Pat Ryan will be able to address this issue on behalf of Delaware Tech in further detail.

Mr. Wertz inquired what Delaware Tech saw the selected nonprofit obtaining by the completion of the process. Mr. Pedersen explained the project deliverables would be useful for fundraisers, grant applications, and other organizational development activities. Mr. Pedersen explained that traditionally the nonprofit has received a packet of information with a disk etc., but that he realizes

that in the past it may not have been handled correctly. Mr. Wheedleton shared that the client needs to be clear on what they will be expecting to gain from participating in Mr. Pedersen's Service Learning project. Mr. Wheedleton suggested that they could put a disclaimer on the drawings or give clients pdf's of drawings that cannot be revised. Mr. Wheedleton further explained that it will be made clear to the client that the products are not to be taken to a bank or a builder. Mr. Wheedleton inquired as the students will be doing work under the guidance of a registered architect with Mr. Pedersen, if the work they complete will be acceptable to the Board. Mr. Jennings stated that the work the students will be doing will be under the academic supervision of Mr. Pedersen and not that of supervision of the practice of architecture. Mr. Mateyko added that if it is the supervision of practice then it will be a different issue.

Mr. Mateyko explained that he is having difficulty differentiating this service learning project from that of a studio project. A studio project, Mr. Mateyko stated, would include energy and site analysis, zoning, traffic, estimates, etc. Mr. Mateyko explained this is all part of design development and is valuable to a student. Mr. Mateyko stated that he sees the Service Learning project to have some components of a studio project. Mr. Wheedleton stated that he believes the project to be an academic process that will take a semester and will benefit the students and that the client will need to understand the goal of the project. Mr. Wheedleton shared that moving forward for the next meeting they need to give some consideration to what the client will be receiving at the end of the project. Mr. Mateyko requested that Mr. Pedersen amend his hand out to include under limitations that no working drawings will be developed and no CAD files will be distributed. Mr. Mateyko clarified that they could go so far as to conceptual design development. Mr. Mateyko stated they can discuss the pros and cons of this further, but feels this revision sharpens the issue. Mr. Wertz requested that the agreement with the nonprofit stipulate that the designs prepared by the students shall not be utilized for any fundraising or grant applications. Mr. Mateyko added that the client shall not represent that the products are instruments of service to be relied upon for actual construction.

Mr. Jennings explained that there is often misconception on the part of the public as to the practice of architecture starting with the sealing of drawings when in fact it begins with preliminary studies, etc. Mr. Mateyko reminded the Board members present that they need to keep in mind that this is for a two year architectural engineering program. Mr. Pedersen stated that he felt encouraged that this type of work could continue without an architect teaching the program. Mr. Jennings stated that often universities have staff who are not licensed architects teaching within their architectural programs. Mr. Mateyko stated that if the project is that of a studio project that he does not believe you need to have a licensed architect running the program. Mr. Wheedleton added that he thinks an important component of the program will be educating the clients on what they will be getting as a result of participating within the program as well as the limitations on the items they receive.


Next Scheduled Meeting

The next meeting will be held on January 2, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. in Conference Room B, second floor of the Cannon Building, 861 Silver Lake Boulevard, Dover, Delaware.

Adjournment

With no further business before the subcommittee, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Meaghan Jerman
Administrative Specialist II

The notes of this meeting are not intended to be a verbatim record of the topics that were presented or discussed. They are for the use of the Board members and the public in supplementing their personal notes and recall for presentations.